EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE
AND GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

Devoted to Theoretical and Practical Religion, Free Enquiry, Religious Liberty, and Intelligence.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL.—PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."—St. Paul.

VOL. IV. [NEW SERIES.] UTICA, N. Y., SATURDAY, AUGUST 24, 1833. No. 34.

COMMUNICATIONS.

[*For the Magazine and Advocate.*]

FOURTH OF JULY CELEBRATIONS AGAIN.

Brs. SKINNER and GROSH—In your twenty-ninth number I notice some remarks on "fourth of July celebrations," which forcibly bring to my mind a communication published in the Rochester Observer,* on occasion of a celebration at York Centre, Livingston county, 1832. The communication to which I allude shows, in some measure, the strong desire, existing in the minds of many, to convert the anniversary birthday of our national independence and happiness, to their own designs and purposes, and, where they fail of success, the "grumbling and growling" *always* felt, and sometimes expressed in misrepresentation and slander.—The celebration of a day, set apart by the greatest and best men of any age, as a great national festival, sacred to liberty and equal rights, civil and religious, and hallowed by the example of the wise and good, for more than half a century, is now, by the "superior discrimination and piety" of modern religionists, to be considered as highly improper and reprehensible. The article is as follows:

"There are many duties of the Christian painful. Oft times has it been his lot, both in ancient and modern times, whilst endeavoring to correct immoralities around him, he is made the subject of scorn and of slander by the profligate and ungodly; who, like the king of Israel with the prophet, do not like him because he does not predict good concerning them. *

* * * * * *

"It is painful to tell you that, notwithstanding these dispensations of Providence; [the cholera, &c.;] notwithstanding the exertions made to arrest vice and immorality; notwithstanding the private and public means employed for the melioration of society here, [York,] intemperance, revelry and profanity are gaining ground.

"Our late fourth of July exhibited an awful confirmation of these facts. It is the testimony of the most discriminating and pious inhabitants, that, for many years, at no public meeting, was there so much intemperance, revelry and profanity. * * * Is it not a pity that the morals of many, in this Christian land, are inferior to those of Heathens? While Christians of all denominations, in our neighboring towns and villages, spent the day in religious services, expressing their gratitude for both their civil and religious liberty to that Being who gave it to them, and their dependence on him for safety in these calamitous times, such, my Dear Sir, were the proceedings of this day in this highly favored place. Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the uncircumcised rejoice, and the Philistines be glad. A SPECTATOR."

* I think I have not mistaken the name of the sectarian paper at Rochester.

The "public meeting" alluded to was a tea party, arranged by the ladies of the village of York. Ladies and gentlemen, to the amount of fifty couple, collected together in the grove, back of Rev. J. B. Whittlesey's house, where the table had been spread. The exercises of the day were commenced by an appropriate prayer by Rev. H. S. Wilkins; the declaration of independence was read, and an oration, on the influence and duty of females in the education of their children, was delivered by the writer of this. The party then assembled around the table, and partook of an *independent* repast, prepared in beautiful rural simplicity; after which the meeting was dismissed by the Rev. J. B. Whittlesey, who returned thanks to the Author of all good for the opportunity which we had once more enjoyed of joining our hearts in friendly congratulations on the return of another anniversary of our country's independence. As to "*intemperance*," to my certain knowledge, there was *no kind* of distilled spirituous liquor whatever drank on the occasion. Such was the "awful confirmation," that "intemperance, revelry and profanity" were "gaining ground," noticed by "A Spectator," or his "most discriminating and pious" informers, who, in his zeal "to correct immoralities around him" forgot that there was such a *sin* as being a "brawler."

Suspicion falling upon a *Rev.* gentleman of rigid puritanical professions and Calvinistic tenets, as the author of the indignity; a direct demand was made, of the Editor of the Observer, for the name of the author—but the only answer ever returned to the demand was a "dignified silence."

Yours truly, JUSTUS GAGE, 2d.

[*For the Magazine and Advocate.*]

BRIEF DIALOGUE—NO. X.

U. Well, Mr. Partialist, you say you have tried to believe in Universalism; will you tell me how you tried? or what you did when you tried to be a Universalist?

P. O, I tried to pacify my mind on the subject of religion, by thinking that finally all would be well—there is no hell, no punishment for sin hereafter—there is no use in preaching or praying—we shall all be saved at last—so I thought I might as well go on in sin as any way.

U. Poor fellow! what a mistake you made, did you not? Did that course lead you to believe in Universalism?

P. No, I soon found that would not do, that it was a false delusion.

U. And then you embraced Partialism?

P. Yes, I found *I* had a work to do in order to be saved.

U. Well, then, instead of trying to be a Universalist, you actually tried to be a Partialist; and you pursued exactly the right course to lead you into it. You took the broad way that leads to destruction, to all intents and purposes. It seemed to you, no doubt, to be the fair way to Universalism, but the end thereof you found to be the frightful death of Partialism. Take a seat with me, occasionally, and I will show you the way out again, and point you to the shining temple of impartial grace!

P. Ah! but I did try to be a Universalist—I did not try to believe Partialism.

U. No, no, you only *thought* you tried—you did not—it was your delusion. Did you not attend Partialist meetings all the while?

P. Yes, I attended their meetings generally, as our family all went there, and I wished to go where they did.

U. Did you attend Universalist meetings at all, while you were trying to believe that doctrine.

P. Yes, I heard Rev. Mr. S****** preach once.

U. Well, how did you like his preaching? Did you believe it?

P. No, I did not really believe it. I thought him a smart man, and I could not discern any thing but that he was a sincere Christian, but I did not really believe his doctrine.

U. Ah! your heart was not right. Did you return home and examine the Bible candidly, to see if what he said was true?

P. No, I *knew* it was not true without looking in the Bible.

U. Yes, you know a great deal about the Bible; but you have a remarkable faculty to keep your knowledge to yourself! Did you read Universalist books and papers the while?

P. No, I read no books of theirs—I frequently saw S******'s paper however.

U. Yes, you *saw* it perhaps, but did you *read* it? You know you dared not read it, especially if any of your Partialist brethren saw you about it.

P. Why, you think me afraid of my neighbors, do you?

U. Yes, most shamefully afraid of them.—You take one of my papers, and sit down in your meeting-house and read it, in the presence of the people, during the intermission next Sunday, will you? How many would say to you, "What! you reading the devil's paper?—are you getting to be a Universalist—going to heaven with drunkards and liars, murderers and all, eh? Well, well, I did not think that you would be *seen* reading that blackguard stuff!" How many would treat you thus?

P. I don't know how many.

U. Well, I will tell you the first step to Universalism, in our day—to be an independent man—ready to do what you think is right and honorable, whether others are pleased about it or not, and more especially upon the subject of religion. Good bye.

P. Good bye, Sir, I shall call again soon.

S. W. F.

[For the Magazine and Advocate.]

ON THE SLEEP OF THE SOUL.

Messrs. Editors—Your paper (No. 30) of July 27th, came to hand by the last mail. I observed and read, hastily, the communication from "*Nemo*," on this subject. My engagements at present are such that I cannot give this writer a *special* notice. But I send you, by the mail in which this letter goes, two numbers of the "Herald of Gospel Truth," &c., in which you will find four numbers of my writing on the subject of the *resurrection*, which I believe will answer for *Nemo* for the present, and which I request you to publish. Some of the texts Nemo has quoted, are explained in my numbers—at least, my views of the texts are given. And I see no difficulty in any of the texts he has quoted; except what is said in the *sleepy* situation of Lazarus.* *Literally* there is a contradiction in the statements respecting the sleepy case of Lazarus; but I have, I think, given the most rational construction of the statements. If the spirit and animal life had both become extinct from the body of Lazarus, Martha would have been correct when she said "*his body stinketh.*" But as this was not the case, I conclude that animation was only suspended in this case, as it frequently has been in many other cases. If this construction is not the true one, the whole transaction, as well as all the circumstances, was a *miracle* from the beginning to the end. But I can see no good reason for such a supposition, and therefore where there is contradiction in the statement of a case, the rationality of the thing should be the criterion to judge by.

In my writings on the subject of the *resurrection*, I have, perhaps, broached a new point, which will, no doubt, alarm some of our *sensitive* brethren—as, if true, it must be a death blow to some of their preconceived notions on this subject. I have said in these numbers, and boldly said, that there *never was*, and *never will be*, any *literal* resurrection, except that of Jesus. [We suppose the writer here means resurrection of the material body. *Ed.*] I was not aware that this was the case till last Winter. I took up the New Testament to be satisfied, if I could, on the resurrection subject; and I read every word of it *carefully*, and noted every passage where the word resurrection was to be found. And in a *close* and *critical* examination of text and context, I came to the conclusion above stated. So fully am I persuaded that this is the correct sense of the resurrection subject, that I have no doubt but what it will, in time, be the opinion of all candid inquirers after truth. But it is hard for some people to shake off preconceived notions—I have no *leaven* of this kind about me—when I set out to learn the truth of a case, I do as General Green did when he entered the revolutionary war—*he laid aside his Quaker coat*—I lay aside my traditional prejudices, my preconceived notions, and go to work in earnest to learn the truth. Start not, then, if I have broached a point so contrary to the general belief—search the subject as I have, and I shall be astonished if you do not see it as I do. But enough of this for the present.

I really wish you to publish the numbers I herewith send you. I must also request you to excuse this hasty scroll, which I have written in a moment snatched from other engagements. And believe me, also, to be truly your friend and brother in the faith,

Joseph Kingsbury.

Sheshequin, Pa., 19th August, 1833.

* When Nemo urges the belief of the Pagans in the natural immortality of man, as an argument *against* the doctrine, it does but excite a smile. The argument, if such it can be called, may as well, and I think with some more plausibility, be urged in *favor* of the doctrine, as *against* it. Would Nemo argue that there was no supreme Divinity because the Pagans believed in Jupiter as such, and had some crude notions in relation to his character? I presume not. For the fact of the Pagans believing in a Divinity, far from disproving, would rather favor that idea.

RESURRECTION.—NO. I.

Much has been said on the subject of the Resurrection. Different are the views of Christians respecting it. Even Christians of the same sect, or denomination, are not agreed upon this momentous concern. I purpose, in the following series of numbers, to make some inquiries into the subject—the time of its consummation, and scriptural consequence. But as I shall disagree with some very learned and worthy men, belonging to the same denomination of Christians to which I belong; I ought, perhaps, to make some apology for the act of *temerity* which I am about to enter into. I have nothing, however, to offer in palliation, but my great anxiety to have this question settled, (at least among Universalists,) and the hope I have of eliciting some truth on the subject—of pointing out a course which others, better qualified, may improve upon and illumine.

In order to start at the foundation of this subject, I think the first inquiry should be—"*What is man?*" In answering this question, I shall attempt to prove, both by Scripture and reason, that man (in this state at least) is a *compound being*—possessing a *soul*, or animal life, and a *spirit*, or heavenly principle. These are totally different and distinct in their natures. The one is composed of matter—is earthly, and must necessarily be *dissolved*. The other is etherial—of a heavenly nature, and therefore *indissoluble*. God saw fit to connect these two principles together for a time; and make the stronger, in some measure, subject to the weaker. Not willingly, however, on the part of the spirit; but he endued it with a hope—a hope that "it should return again to God who gave (made) it." That it should be emancipated from the principle with which its nature could not accord. Faint, however, was this hope, by reason of the inexplicable assimilation of the spirit with the body. Enveloped thus in the darkness of the body, it could not see nor understand distinctly the promise. "That the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head"—the soul, the carnal mind, or its earthly partner. Hence the religion of our Saviour, to convince mankind that death, the death of the body, was the only door to heaven and happiness. He came a perfect being, without sin, and therefore could go through the gates of death, and afterwards take up his own body again. Not so with man—sinful man. When his body is dead it becomes eternally useless to the connexion it stood with, while possessing animation. To suppose there is a resurrection of the body, that it is at some future period in eternity to be resuscitated, after going through millions of decompositions, for aught we know, and then to be reanimated with its old partner again, (the spirit,) is a supposition, in my humble opinion, which outrages both Scripture and common sense. More extraordinary still, is the opinion of some, that the spirit *sleeps* to some future great or general resurrection. But more of this in the sequel.

I must now return to the first proposition. I have said that man, in his present state, was a compound being. Does this proposition want proof? With some it may. I will then refer to one or two passages of Scripture to settle the question. Just before Jesus was betrayed, he took his disciples into a place called Gethsemane, and seated them, all except Peter and the two sons of Zebedee. These three he took to a separate place, "and began to be sorrowful and heavy." He then directs them to tarry, and *watch* with him while he went a little further on, to pray. On his return, he found them asleep, and says to Peter, "What, could ye not watch with me one hour?" But knowing the weakness of human nature, he did not *chide*, but mildly answered his own question. "The *spirit*, indeed, is willing, but the *flesh* is weak." Matt. xxvi. St. Paul says, "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor; yet what I shall choose, I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two (opinions) having a desire to depart, and be with Christ; which is far better. Nevertheless, to *abide in the flesh* is more needful for you." Phil. i: 21–24.

Many more passages from the New Testament might be selected, applying to the point in question; but I believe these two will be sufficient. The latter text is an important one on another point, which I shall discuss in a future number.

But has reason any thing to do with the question under consideration? Surely it has, or else St. Paul, in the text I have quoted, was an *unreasonable* man. I appeal to the experience of any man if he has not discovered in his own bosom, the principle of *vice*, as well as that of *virtue*. The one contending against the other; and whether he ever discovered, in reality, any harmony or consanguinity between the two? If not, he must, in this state, be composed of two distinct principles, as variant and much opposed to each other, as light is to darkness. I know the Orthodox confound the whole man into one simple being, and bring in an *extrinsic* influence, to lead him astray. And this influence, they contend, is *insinuated* by a wonderful personage, whom they have christened devil.—But they must first prove the existence of such a being—from whom and whence he originated—the necessity of such a monster, in the order of God's providence, and give some better account of his place of residence, than ever they have done, or mankind will shortly *scout* this auxiliary of theirs out of the high rank he now holds. But this, I am bold to say, they never can do. First, Because the Bible is silent on the creation of such a *nondescript*, which must naturally be supposed would not have been the case, if he had any thing to do with man; otherwise it would impeach the goodness of our heavenly Father, who could turn out his offspring into a den of lions, tigers or wolves, without giving them any notice of the enemies they would have to encounter. "Thorns and thistles," they look to encounter, and "to eat their bread in the sweat of their face." But not a word of information did they receive about this great enemy to their happiness.

Second. The nature of man, in his present state, requires no such influence as that which is said to come from a personal devil, to lead him into sin; because his earthly part is sufficient for that purpose—which the spirit, or heavenly part, has a hard-enough struggle to withstand; and would, if it had this Orthodox devil to fight also, be much worse off than was Leonidas in the pass of Thermopylæ!

I have dwelt longer on this point than I otherwise should, did I not believe that the old fashioned opinion respecting the construction or composition of man, had not, some how, a lateral influence on the opinions of those who contend that "MAN IS MORTAL"—the *whole* man; to support which, man must be a simple, and not a compound being. And if a simple being, how the consequence of annihilation can be avoided, is beyond my weak comprehension to discover. But I flatter myself that the pathway to the understanding is now open, and if the road is not made so smooth and eligible as others might have made it, it should be charged to those who have the abilities, but not the *will*, to have made it so, and not to me.

RESURRECTION.—NO. II.

"We believe all that constitutes man what he is, *dies*." So say some of our most learned and most respectable ministering brethren. And did I not know that others of the same class, as learned and respectable, were of a different opinion, I should set down Christianity as a theme either *too abstruse*, or *too ridiculous*, for a layman to puzzle his brains about, or a *chimera* contrived for the special benefit of the few, to gain their support and living out of the many. But this is not the case. The Gospel of Jesus is not such a mystery as not to be easily understood, even by laymen, if they would but take the pains to examine its principles with candor and impartiality, divesting themselves of the prejudices of education, and the lateral influence arising from

preconceived notions. The above notion which I have quoted as an introduction to this number—and which I shall, for the sake of distinction, denominate the *deadly system*—no doubt originated in the preconceived notions of retributive justice, and the supposed advantage to be gained in an argument with Partialists, who contend that a sinner who is taken off suddenly from this world, in the height of his crimes, must be punished in another world, or otherwise it is greatly to his advantage to be thus taken off, as he would in this case escape punishment altogether. It appears, to me, however, that the plan adopted to avoid the supposed difficulty, is as absurd as the difficulty it would avoid; and if not jumping out of the frying pan into the fire, would be jumping out of the Orthodox fire of hell into annihilation. For my part, I see no difficulty in this case, if we can only get rid of the preposterous notion of a personal devil, whose business, it seems, is to lead the spirit of man into sin, that he may have the pleasure of tossing it into the lake of burning lava. The fact is, the earthly nature of man is nothing but a lump of vanity, whose soul, or animal life, is the same as that possessed by the brute creation. It seeks to gratify its earthly propensity in opposition to the spirit—a principle the brutes do not possess; and it has, in reality, no heavenly desires. And when practising virtue, it is only overruled and led into it, by the commanding influence of the spirit, which, in itself, separately considered, is always in opposition to sin, and "groaneth and travaileth in pain, with the body." But, "for what the law (spirit) could not do in that it was weak through the flesh," the Partialists would have it condemned for this very weakness it could not avoid. But the Scripture says, "sin is condemned in the flesh," and nowhere does it say that sin is condemned in the spirit. If the cause is then removed by the death of the body, I ask, in the name of common sense, if the effect is not removed also? Would it be an act of justice to punish an innocent person, who, from accident or necessity, should happen to be caught in company with a rogue, whom justice was seeking for punishment? All will answer, No. And is man more just than God? or is justice a different principle with God from what it is with man? Answer, O ye Partialists!

But, say some of our friends, "all that constitutes man what he is, *dies*." I would ask these friends, if the death of a living principle is not, virtually, annihilation of the living principle thus dead? I would ask them the meaning of the word resurrection. Is it the raising up of a principle totally extinct? If it be so, it must be a creation, and not a resurrection; and the term would, rightly understood, be peculiarly adapted to the production of Adam and Eve, when brought into existence by the great Ruler of the universe.

But, says the objector, the body of Jesus was raised. True, it was. And this is all the resurrection, strictly speaking, there ever was, or ever will be, in my humble opinion. The body of Jesus was without sin, and without corruption, and was resuscitated with the spirit, and not with animal life. He would not suffer it to be touched, before he had ascended to the Father, and no doubt it was as cold as when it lay in the tomb, not possessing blood nor animal life. But when celestialized, as St. Paul would have it, he suffered Thomas to examine his hands and his side. But again, says the objector, was not Lazarus raised from the dead? His friends thought so, and to all appearance, no doubt, he was dead. But what does Jesus say on the subject? "This sickness [of Lazarus] is not unto death." And again—"Our friend Lazarus sleepeth: but I go that I may awake him out of sleep."

Again, says the objector, we read (Matt. xxvii: 52, 53) that "the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose, and came out of the graves after his [Christ's] resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."

This is an objection that needs investigation. In the first place, this circumstance of the bodies of the saints arising is not mentioned by any other of the evangelists; nor is it mentioned in any of the writings of the New Testament, except as above quoted. It would seem that a circumstance so extraordinary and important must have been known to the other evangelists and apostles of Jesus, and if known, would have been mentioned. But not a word is said about it any where in the New Testament, except in Matthew. It seems, at least, that Peter was ignorant of the circumstance. David was allowed to be a saint, and a man after God's own heart, and would unquestionably have been among the first raised from his "grave." But Peter says, Acts ii: 34, "For David has not ascended into the heavens." By this I understand, that the body of David had not ascended into the heavens, as had that of Jesus, which Peter was trying to convince the Jews had been raised from the dead. It seems to have been the first and greatest object of the apostles to prove the resurrection of Jesus; not, as I understand, that the dead bodies of the human family were to be raised as a consequence of his resurrection. If this had been the case, and it had been known to the apostles that "many bodies of the saints" had "arose," the many unto whom they appeared would, unquestionably, have been called upon as witnesses to the fact. But nothing of this was ever done, nor have the *many* thus spoken of ever said a word about this wonderful resurrection, that we have any account of. Hence, I conclude that the passage in question is an interpolation, *foisted* into the original text by some zealot, (who did not understand the principles of the resurrection,) with a view to prove that which genuine Scripture, reason, and common sense would prove to be a *chimera*.

Again; Acts iv: 2, "Being grieved that they taught the people, through Jesus, the resurrection from the dead." Who were those that were grieved by the preaching of such doctrines? It is well known that the Sadducees did not believe in any resurrection. But were all the priests, and the Captain of the temple, Sadducees? If so, their grief was natural. But if there were any Pharisees among them, preaching simply the resurrection, unconnected with Jesus, it would not have offended them, for it was what they believed in. Therefore I understand this text as solely applying to the resurrection of Jesus, and such preaching caused the offence. And further on (ver. 33) it is so stated—"And with great power gave the apostles, witness of the resurrection of Jesus." This point once gained, the inference was certain. "The head of the serpent was bruised," and man had an existence beyond the grave. The horrible idea of death, an eternal death, was the cause, no doubt, of the enmity of man against his Maker. Jesus, "a man like unto us," was sent to convince man that this enmity was without cause. That the death they dreaded, was, in fact and in truth, the only means by which to obtain perfect happiness.

Again: John xii: 24, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." See also the parallel text, 1 Cor. xv: 36, "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." These texts are brought forward as proof, that all that belongs to man, dies; but they are among the texts that I should adduce to prove the contrary opinion. Does the *germ*, or life, of the kernel of grain die? Surely not. This every farmer knows, whether the *literati* know it or not. The moment the kernel of grain begins to die, (or, as it alludes to man, his earthly body,) the germ begins to sprout into existence; and before the kernel is reduced to a milky state, (as it alludes to man, a state of corruption,) the sprout from the germ, is out of its case—progressing onwards for a new crop. But suppose the germ should die along with the kernel, (or, as it alludes to man, his spirit,) would it ever produce any thing afterwards? Could it ever be resuscitated? There is none that would say it could. It would be a complete annihilation both of the kernel and germ, or life of the grain. And so it would be with man on the deadly hypothesis I am contending against. To talk about a resurrection, in this case would be committing such violence on terms as would be impossible to reconcile. A new creation might be contended for. But what possible interest could man have in such new creation—even admitting the particles of matter from his former self are collected from the crucibles of time, in which our bodies have gone through so many decompositions, as materials out of which to form a celestial body? Would the reminiscences of a former life be collected also? And if not, what interest has man in the matter? Man must either live eternally, or be eternally dead! Conscious identity must be preserved, or man might seek his utmost beastly pleasure here—eat and drink, for to-morrow he dies; because conscious identity cannot be preserved in an entire new creation. J. K.

Sheshequin, Pa.

[Concluded next week.]

[*For the Magazine and Advocate.*]

THE RESURRECTION....FAITH OF THE ANCIENTS.

Brs. Skinner and Grosh—In the 27th number of the Magazine and Advocate I discover an article headed as above, signed E. Smith, Henrietta, containing strictures and observations upon my sermon, published in the 21st number of your paper. In reply I submit the following.

Br. Smith says he has read my sermon with much satisfaction—he assures us that he regards the doctrine of the resurrection as lying at the foundation of the Christian's hope—and adds, "while, therefore, I highly regard the manner in which Br. Bullard has treated this important subject, I trust I shall not need to presume upon his Christian liberality, if I offer a few reasons in opposition to another sentiment contained in his otherwise excellent sermon."

Br. Smith will receive my thanks for the flattering manner in which he has condescended to notice my humble production, while I assure him no one is better satisfied than myself at the liberty he has taken in pointing out what he calls "the objectionable feature" in my discourse, and in offering his reasons in opposition thereto. If I am in an error I wish to be corrected; I hold no sentiments which I am unwilling to have investigated—especially if treated in that candid and charitable manner in which Br. Smith has treated this subject. I will assure Br. Smith, and the readers of the Magazine, that I am not very tenacious of my views in question; nor were they adopted either hastily or from choice, but with a view to reconcile the Scriptures. If, therefore, the Scriptures can be reconciled on any other ground, I am willing to give them up; but of this, I am at present very doubtful.

The reader will now please turn to Br. Smith's article referred to above, and read the extract containing the objectionable feature in my sermon, noticed by him. In laboring to prove that the Christian faith relative to a future state, is established exclusively upon the resurrection of Christ, I observed, among other considerations, that the Scriptures furnish no other *satisfactory* evidence upon the subject: and that the wisest of men, previous to the resurrection of Christ, and in Old Testament times, express themselves in a very doubtful manner upon the subject of futurity. Br. Smith thinks my views, in this respect, are highly erroneous; but I confess, what he has said upon the subject, tends rather to confirm me in my views, than convince me of my error. Certainly he has presented nothing new upon the subject, and nothing that I had not considered before penning my discourse. I say he has confirmed me in my views, because he has given up most of those passages considered in my sermon, and which have been generally supposed to refer to a future state; while he has adduced other texts, in opposition to my views, which, as I conceive, have no more reference to a future state, than that class of texts, urged by Partialists, in support of the doctrine of endless misery.

What Br. Smith has said as to Dr. Campbell's motive in making the assertion referred to by me, I consider unfounded. I have a better opinion of the Dr. than to believe he would deviate from the truth to meet the arguments of his opponents; nor can I see as his assertion, relative to the silence of the Old Testament, &c., has the least possible bearing in the argument, &c., of Universalists, mentioned by Br. Smith, unless it tends to strengthen it: and then, again, it is not to be presumed that Campbell had any occasion to provide against this argument at the time he wrote. I am of the opinion that Dr. Campbell has given us his honest sentiments respecting the Old Testament, and that without re-

gard to their tendency, or any bearing they might have in the argument for or against the doctrine of endless misery. Br. Smith thinks my argument tends rather to weaken, than strengthen the Christian's faith. It is not the tendency, but the correctness of my argument, which we seek. I must be allowed, however, to differ from him even in this—it may have that effect upon him, but upon me, the effect is the reverse. "It is for this reason," he says, "and for this alone, that I oppose it." "And further," he says, "I am inclined to think no true sentiment would have this effect." I am inclined to think, also, that no true sentiment would have a bad effect upon one who believed it, but what effect it might have upon one who disbelieved it, is uncertain. Partialists say, if they believed Universalism, they would indulge in all manner of licentiousness—and is Br. Smith willing to acknowledge that this is, therefore, the natural tendency of the doctrine; and that they are proper judges in this matter?—Now as Br. Smith does not believe my views, why should he presume to determine their effects? The tendency of a thing is the last argument a man should resort to, in proof of its correctness or incorrectness. I would inform Br. Smith, and the readers of the Magazine, that I do not believe in the doctrine of the resurrection because others believe it, or because it has been believed by men in all ages of the world; but because it has been demonstrated to my satisfaction, four thousand years since the world began.

In reviewing the arguments of Br. Smith drawn from the passages quoted by him and me, I shall, for the sake of convenience, address my remarks directly to him.

Br. Smith, you notice, in order, my first quotation in defence of my position, Job xiv: 7-9, "For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, &c., but man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" This, said I, is the language of doubt. And I had no idea of being disputed, at least by one who pretended to understand the meaning of language. But you understand the above language to be the writer's argument to prove the future existence of man, rather than the expression of doubt on the subject. I confess I am not a little surprised at the light in which you view his language. Certain I am, if you can construe it into an argument in proof of man's future existence, no language can come amiss. Job says, "we have hope of a tree," but does he say we have hope of man? No. The scene is changed—"But man dieth and wasteth away; he giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" Such language needs no comment—it speaks for itself—and the reader may judge whether it is not the language of doubt, as to man's future existence. Again, you say, "at verse 12th it is certainly implied that man shall have a future existence." It may be so, but, from the connexion, I am inclined to think otherwise. Be this as it may, in a matter like this, implication proves nothing, of course. I had not overlooked the fourteenth and fifteenth verses, but had my eye upon them when I said—Job nowhere furnishes an answer to these questions. And instead of viewing them as you do, I consider them as further expressions of doubt on the subject of futurity. Verse 14th, "If a man die, shall he live again?" "This," you say, "does not appear to be the language of doubt." If it does not, I know nothing about appearances. But you say, "the latter clause is an answer to this question." Well, let us see. "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." Curious answer, truly! You ask whether it can be supposed that by the term change, the writer meant nothing better than nonentity, and labor to show that, because it is used in Corinthians in allusion to the resurrection, it must be understood so here. But I would ask, in turn, did Job expect to be raised before he died, and that immediately at the expiration of the days of his appointed time? It must be recollected that Paul uses this term when speaking of what should happen to the dead; but Job, when speaking of what should happen to the living, and that at the expiration of their appointed time. It appears, therefore, that the two cases are dissimilar; hence one should be considered no rule for the other, unless it can be shown that the term change invariably signifies resurrection. But you think, "that the writer spoke of what would take place with him after death, there can be no doubt; but this," you add, "will appear still more clear when the next verse is associated with it." Well, what is it? Why, it is the following. Verse 15th, "Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee. Thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hand." Well done, Br. Smith, I confess I am confounded! I wish to treat you kindly, but surely, Sir, you are the last man, except an Orthodox clergyman, that would have thought of a future state while reading the above texts. The "first admits of no doubt, the second is yet more clear," though neither says any thing about a future state, to which you apply them. You are not disposed to doubt my explication of Job xix: 26—but, in the preceding verse, ("I know that my Redeemer liveth," &c.) you think the writer alludes to Christ. But surely it requires no great stretch of discernment to see, that these texts are inseparably connected, and that they both belong to the same event.—It seems very strange, therefore, that you should give up one, while you contend for the other. When you convince me that the language of Job, thus far considered, alludes to a future state of being, and that from it an argument may be drawn in proof of the resurrection of man and his existence after death, I shall then be prepared to acknowledge the force and application of those passages generally adduced by Partialists, in support of the doctrines of a general judgment, and ceaseless punishment in the eternal world. For my part, I discover nothing in Job's writings in proof of man's future existence. Viewing things as you do, I am surprised when you say "that the wisdom of Solomon seems to have been worldly wisdom; and that he seems to have had no prophetic inspiration," since the most plausible texts, in favor of your position, are evidently found in his writings. Were I called upon to defend your position, I would give more for one text from Solomon's writings than for all you can glean from the book of Job; notwithstanding, I think Solomon is silent on the subject of a future state.

Having given up Solomon, you ask, "Can the same be said of the psalmist David? If so, how shall we understand the following passages?" Ps. xvi: 10, "For thou wilt not leave my soul in (sheol) hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." This text Peter applies to Christ, and says, David spoke of his resurrection; but does it follow from this that the Christian's faith, relative to a future life and glory, became established previous to the resurreetion of Christ, and that the Old Testament furnishes *satisfactory* evidence upon the subject? Certainly not. But this is what you have attempted to prove. At any rate, it is all that I have denied. You attempt to apply this text, or a part of it, to David; but Peter shows that none of it should be thus applied, and says, "that David did see corruption; and that his sepulchre is with us unto this day." But apply it as you may, the text is too local to prove a general position. Certainly it has no appearance of a revelation from God to David of the future life and immortality of the world of mankind, nor does it appear that David viewed it in this light. David believed that Christ would be raised up to sit on his throne.

A reference to the context will show that your other texts from Psalms have no allusion to the subject in question. But whether we appeal to the context or not, they are too indefinite, not to say obscure, to have any bearing in the argument. David mourns over the iniquitous and persecuting course pursued by his enemies, and then closes, by expressing his determination to maintain his integrity, amid the corrupt examples of the wicked, as follows: "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness, I shall be satisfied when I awake (or appear, or to appear) in thy likeness, or be found like thee." Ps. xvii: 15. "When my father and mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up." Ps. xxvii: 10. In this text David expresses his confidence in the Lord, to be greater than that reposed in his father and mother.

WALTER BULLARD.

[Concluded next week.]

[For the Magazine and Advocate.]

GOOD COMING OUT OF EVIL.

Br. SKINNER—Just before I went to the West, I was invited to deliver a lecture in the village of Moscow, and accordingly left an appointment to that effect. The assent of most of the proprietors of the academical school-house was obtained, for holding our meeting in that building, as it was the only suitable place for public worship to be found in the village, save the meeting-houses belonging to the Presbyterians and Methodists, which were, as was to have been expected, "forbidden fruit." But on visiting the place for the fulfilment of the appointment, it was ascertained that one of the Deacons of the Presbyterian church had the key of said school-house; and that the Presbyterians had made an appointment to occupy the house themselves, at the same time ours was to be fulfilled. Having the staff in their own hands, like the dog in the manger, who would neither eat the hay himself, nor suffer the ox to do so, they shut up their own doors, leaving the house unoccupied; and then took possession of the other, in order, as it would seem, to prevent our holding meeting as was proposed.

But blessed be God, who ever provides for his saints in every place, and makes his cause to triumph in every land; we were by no means daunted or frustrated by this unexpected movement of the enemy, but exercising the liberty a free government has secured to us, we went on to the common, and in God's house not made with hands, we adored and worshipped under the open sky, the Hand that made us, and spread around us so many tokens of his changeless love and unfailing mercies. This act of intolerance and illiberality so aroused the feelings of the citizens of that place, that measures were immediately adopted for building a house that should be a place of prayer for all people, to be under the direction and management of the Universalist denomination. And already nearly $2000 have been subscribed. It will doubtless go on.

This shows that the age is too enlightened to countenance or brook intolerance, or to suffer sectarism to usurp complete control over the minds of men; and the day is not far distant, when priestly domination and self-righteousness will be compelled to submit to the mild and tolerant principles of liberty and equality. L. L. S.

[For the Magazine and Advocate.]

HAPPINESS OF TRUE BELIEVERS.

Conversing a few days since with Mrs. L., (widow of the late W. L. Esq., of this town, both of whom were members of the Baptist church,) and having recently been informed that her daughter Mary, (who resides in Essex county,) had embraced the Universalist faith, I related what I had heard, and then inquired, What do you think of Mary, Mrs. L.? "I do not think," she replied, "that any one *can sincerely believe that doctrine.*" I then, in the strongest language possible, expressed my unequivocal belief, and soul-cheering rest therein. The pious, good old lady (for such she emphatically is) made answer in the following terms: "Well, if I had *no doubts* in it—if I *fully believed* it, I should be a *great deal happier than I am.*" I smiled, and after repeating Paul's words, "we which have believed do enter into rest," withdrew.—Thus we see that those who are the farthest from believing, are forced to acknowledge the happifying effects of our faith. "Their Rock is not as our Rock, our enemies themselves being judges."

Luzerne, Warren county, August 1. T. B. H.

[For the Magazine and Advocate.]

The following remarks are designed, in part, as a correction of one of the Editors of this paper (in the remarks which he has made, see No. 31, page 246, upon the subject to which this refers) and are expressive of the views and feelings of the "Br." alluded to.

I would wish to be understood, that had Br. L. merely said, "We have no salvo for villany—no refuge for infamy to shield herself—no atonement—no vicarious sacrifice—no imputed righteousness—no change of heart—no sudden conversions—by which the unprincipled may put on the surreptitious

garments of a false theology, and impose upon mankind under the sanction of piety;" he (the Br. referred to) would make no objection. But this is garbling the sentence, by leaving out the words, "in short, no juggler's tricks;" which it is believed will appear, to many at least, to represent the *whole* as being the works of darkness and deception, and nothing better than "juggler's tricks"—the same as though he had said, "nor any *other* juggler's tricks."

I would suggest to my brethren the propriety of being very cautious, when in Council, transacting business in which the great body of Universalists are considered responsible, what they sanction, and especially what they publish to so large an extent, as the circulation of this paper.

I hope Br. L., and all others concerned, will receive the above remarks in the like feelings of brotherly friendship with which they are written—and may we all have that charity which "thinketh no evil," or *intendeth* none, at least. SENEX.

[*For the Magazine and Advocate.*]

LOOSE NOT THE BANDS FROM THE UNTAME TIGER.

The tiger is, perhaps, by nature, of all animals the most malignant and ferocious. Yet by a gentle and skilful course of discipline, he may be rendered so docile that you may play with him as with a kitten.

The child who has always been accustomed to the lash of the whip, is backward to obey until he feels its goadings. Yet place him under a more judicious master, and he is reduced, by discretion and clemency, to a willing and cheerful obedience.

So the human heart, with all its naturally evil propensities strengthened by the influence of false doctrine, may, by the force of divine grace, be brought into an easy compliance with the precepts of moral virtue.

Many who have been educated in the belief of endless misery, as the punishment of sin, suppose and declare, that were this restraint removed, they would not hesitate to steal, rob, and even murder! This only shows that they are strangers to that "perfect love" which "casteth out fear." That their carnal inclinations have never been subdued by the power of sovereign grace. That the things they should *hate*, they still *love*, but *dare* not practice them. In short, that they are *tigers*, caged and fettered, but not *tamed*.

It may be well for preachers in the ministry of reconciliation, when dealing with such, to tame and subdue them by the correcting hand of Gospel chastisement, before they unbar their *cage* of darkness, break asunder their *bands* of superstition, and emancipate them into the glorious liberty of the Gospel. L. C. B.

Fort Plain, N. Y., August, 1833.

ORTHODOX EVIDENCE.

A certain Orthodox writer, in one of the first papers of that order, has recently endeavored to prove that Universalists cannot be Christians. And reader, how do you think he succeeded? If you will give attention, we will show you.

He says, "I think Universalists cannot be Christians, because they do not believe in the necessity of repentance, and a change of heart." This by the way, is utterly false. But let us go on. That writer's conscience accused him of a falsehood, when he wrote the above; and he, therefore, added, "Perhaps some will think this a FALSE accusation, (yes, he was right) and I *know* they sometimes have *much to say* about *repentance* and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and the necessity of having the right faith, &c., but it is plain that they do not believe in these doctrines AS THE ORTHODOX DO, i. e. *if they believe in repentance at all, they must mean something by it which we do not.*"

Extreme modesty! wonderful consistency! irresistible evidence! How easy is it now to prove that the Orthodox are not Christians. They cannot be Christians because they do not believe in the necessity of repentance. "I know they sometimes have much to say about repentance; but it is plain that they do not believe in these doctrines as the *Universalists* do, i. e. if they believe in repentance at all, they must mean something by it which we do not."

It is a poor rule that will not work both ways.—*Trumpet.*

MAGAZINE AND ADVOCATE.

DOLPHUS SKINNER, Editor and Proprietor,
AARON B. GROSH, Associate Editor.

UTICA, SATURDAY, AUGUST 24, 1833.

AVERY AND THE METHODISTS.

It would seem that the Methodists of New-England, generally, were determined on identifying their own character and destiny with that of Ephraim K. Avery, the supposed (and as a large majority of community believe him to be) murderer of Sarah Maria Cornell. The New-England Conference of Methodists voted to clear him from the charge and all suspicion of any illicit intercourse with, or any hand in the murder of, Miss Cornell; determined on re-stationing him again at Bristol, in despite of public opinion; and, as if that were not a sufficient outrage upon the community, the Rhode-Island Conference of Methodists have lately sent agents through different and distant sections of the country to beg contributions to defray the expenses of Avery's trial, amounting to $6,000 or $7,000, in consequence of there being employed so many Methodist witnesses and artful lawyers to evade the force of truth and turn aside the course of justice. We understand large contributions have been taken up for this purpose in various places. The begging seems to be so successful, that a writer in a Washington paper offers the New-England Methodist Conference $50,000 for the exclusive privilege of begging for E. K. Avery, for the next ten years. We think the result of this sympathy of the Methodists in New-England for Avery, and their attempts to palm him on the world as an immaculate saint, when it is a well known fact that the whole of the jury who acquitted him *legally*, through their interpretation of the law, *believed him guilty* nevertheless, and ninety-nine in one hundred of community believe him guilty, must operate to the serious detriment of the Methodist cause throughout the Union, but particularly so in New-England. S.

MIRACLES.

Many skeptical minds cannot conceive the propriety of miracles, and hence doubt their performance. What is a miracle? Say they "it is the performance or occurrence of some act *contrary* to the laws of nature—a suspension or violation of the laws which govern the universe." What are those laws of nature? "We do not pretend to say what *all* of them are, for we are but partially acquainted with only a few of them." May not miracles, then, be caused by the operation of natural laws with which we are unacquainted? The negative of this must be granted, before I can admit the first definition of miracles. The negative must first be *believed* before it can be believed that miracles are unnatural, or even *supernatural*.

It is the common law of nature that men and fowls have but one head and two arms for each individual—yet individuals of these species have been born who had two heads and four legs each. Was this a contradiction or violation of the laws of nature? Oh, no; for this can be partially accounted for—or at least a theory can be framed or imagined which will go very far towards accounting for it—[illegible]tural principles. And why may it not be imagine[illegible] miracles are the result of certain laws of nature to us unknown, which were brought into operation by causes to us unknown, at that particular juncture? The fortuitous concurrence of the events which produced that particular operation, is as much an interposition of God, as a miracle, on the common views, could be—and therefore a miracle—an attestation of Heaven in favor of him who commands and performs it—it may be he knows not how. I do not say that all miracles were thus performed—though I do not see why they may not consistently be thus accounted for—but submit the foregoing for consideration. G.

[*For the Magazine and Advocate.*]

SLANDEROUS FALSEHOOD AGAIN.

Brs. SKINNER and GROSH—The time has been when professed teachers of religion did not appear to feel any accountability for their misrepresentations or false statements; but as those whirlwinds with which we have been visited have in some degree passed away in this county, it should be expected that clergymen in good standing will again be held morally responsible to the public for the truth of their statements upon the subject of religion. I therefore send you the inclosed affidavit of Dr. Clark, containing a statement made by Rev. Mr. Hoyt, as he passed through this village a short time since, on a journey to the East. After the report had become pretty general, and the inquiry began to be made whether it was before or after Mr. Skinner preached here, that he "dare not preach his doubts upon the subject of eternal misery, notwithstanding the doctrine might be true," I went to Esq. Bailey and asked him if Mr. Hoyt reported the story then in circulation. He told me he *did so.*—I then asked him to give me a written statement of what Mr. Hoyt said—he said he would think of the subject until the next day, and presumed he should have no objections. I called the day following, and he informed me that he had concluded not to comply with my request, for the reason that the statement was made to himself and Rev. H. S. Johnson (the Presbyterian minister in this town) and he did not wish to draw him before the public—that he expected him to return soon, and if he chose he could make a statement himself. I replied he had made the statement, and I thought stated what he *knew to be untrue*—that I wished to send his statement, in the form of an affidavit, to Messrs. Skinner and Grosh, with a request, if it was true, to admit it publicly; if not, give them an opportunity of charging the falsehood upon Mr. Hoyt. He then informed me that Mr. Hoyt *could not be mistaken*; for he gave the particulars, and said he was invited by Dr. Lansing to preside at the sessions, and in the course of the meeting he requested some of them who wished to join the church to come forward and give their relation—that a man came forward and said he had been a Universalist, &c.—that Mr. Hastings sat by and said that was too good to keep, and must be published—that Mr. H. was a respectable minister, brother to the Editor of the Western Recorder, and Corresponding Secretary of the Western Education Society at Auburn, and as to truth and veracity, he stood beyond the power of contradiction. As I do not know that he has any business to the East but to report this wonderful story, the "good of the cause" in which he is engaged may require his return some other way. I therefore send you his story, as reported by Esq. Bailey, with the hope that if you dare not preach your doubts on the subject of endless misery, you will have the courage to teach that "all liars shall have their part in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone," even if they should *happen to be Presbyterian clergymen.* Yours truly,

MINOT JENISON.

Canton, St. Lawrence county, August 7, 1833.

AFFIDAVITS.

Darius Clark, of Canton, St. Lawrence county, N. Y., physician, being duly sworn, deposes and says, that, sometime during the present month of July, this deponent had a conversation with Jeremiah Bailey, Esq., attorney at law, and a member of the Presbyterian church in the town of Canton, in which the said Bailey declared to the deponent, as nearly as he can remember, that the Rev. Otto Hoyt a Presbyterian clergyman, told the said Bailey that in a religious meeting at Utica, at which the said Hoyt was called to preside, a young man declared openly in the said meeting, that he, having formerly been a firm believer in the doctrine of universal salvation, and having become weary of life, resolved to commit suicide and thus go to heaven—that before putting his determination into execution

he sent for Rev. Messrs. Skinner and Grosh of Utica, and in their presence declared his determination, and also produced a pair of pistols with which he intended to terminate his existence—that Messrs. Skinner and Grosh advised him to desist, alleging as a reason, that there might be some doubt about there being no eternal punishment in a future world—that the young man then expressed much surprise, and inquired their reasons for not telling him before, their doubts upon the subject; and they replied, that it would not do to preach their doubts—that the young man became immediately convinced of his error, and became soon after a member of the Presbyterian church in Utica. DARIUS CLARK.

Subscribed and sworn before me, this seventh day of August, 1833. MINOT JENISON,
Judge of St. Lawrence county Courts.

Parker Boynton, being duly sworn, says, that his store is next door to Esq. Bailey's office—that he has heard him relate the statement (in substance, in the above affidavit of Dr. Clark's) made by Rev. Otto Hoyt, and that he believes he made it a subject of *common conversation* from the time Mr. Hoyt was here until Mr. Jenison requested him to give a written statement of said conversation.

PARKER BOYNTON.

Subscribed and sworn before me this seventh day of August, 1833, MINOT JENISON,
Judge of St. Lawrence county Courts.

REMARKS.

The above story has reached us, in substance, from all points of the compass, and times almost without number. We have twice before now alluded to it, and solemnly and positively denied its truth. (See Vol. II. Magazine and Advocate, pages 133 and 399.) There was an attempt at suicide in this city some two and a half years since—we saw the young man incidentally at the time, (though not by his invitation,) and probably prevented him from committing suicide: but no such conversation as that related above ever took place between him and us, or any thing *in the least resembling it.* Moreover, the young man was never a member of any Universalist society, nor (so far as we could learn) did he ever even believe in the doctrine. About a year subsequent to that time he united with Dr. Lansing's church in this city; and nothing was ever heard about any such conversation till *after* his union with Dr. L.'s church.—Since he joined said church he has been guilty of crimes punishable by confinement in the State prison, and has fled to parts unknown.

In view of these facts, well known to the people of this city, if our solemn declaration before God and the world, repeatedly made and published in the very place where the transaction was said to have occurred, will not be taken by community in preference to a *vague report*, said to have originated a year after the transaction, with a man of the polluted character which this young man is known to sustain, then community are welcome to their credulity—we shall not trouble ourselves further about the affair. But we would admonish the retailers of the above slanderous report that "all liars *shall* (not merely *may*, but *positively shall*) have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone."

As to the doctrine of *endless misery*, we have neither of us had, since we commenced preaching, any more doubts of its *absolute falsity* than we have of the falsity of *Mahommed's Alcoran*, or the *religion of the Hindoos.*

DOLPHUS SKINNER,
A. B. GROSH.

THE RESURRECTION.

The reception of several articles on the speculative doctrines of the immortality and sleep of the soul, the nature or period of the resurrection, and the knowledge or ignorance of the ancients respecting the same—as also the great length of some of those articles—obliges the Editors to remind the controversialists that these are subjects next to unimportant to many of our readers, and their discussion disagreeable to those who dread a schism on their account. Though interested somewhat ourselves in the discussion, and willing it should progress, yet we are obliged to consult the feelings of our readers in presenting them the weekly feast of good things. We therefore wish our correspondents would condense and abridge their articles as much as possible, while discussing the subject. We will endeavor to give each party about equal space and room—equal attention and favor in our paper, so long as they see fit to continue the discussion in a cool, candid and interesting manner. We think we can keep this promise, as even between us there may be some slight differences in opinion on the subject in dispute. At least, if we err, it will not be deliberately and wilfully. Hereafter, then, remember, brethren, brevity is the soul of wit—conciseness and clearness the shortest road to conviction. Bring forth your strongest, plainest proofs and reasons on both sides—and contend for *truth*, not victory—for knowledge and reason, not mere speculation and prejudice.

EDITORS.

MODERN INVENTIONS—NEW MODE OF MAKING CONVERTS.

The following articles we copy from the Albany "Journal and Telegraph," a thoroughgoing Presbyterian paper of the old school stamp. The stories have long been before the public and are too true to make a jest of. Mr. B. who is mentioned as the "*presiding* clergyman," is Mr. Burchard, as he was the manager of the Clinton protracted meeting. Whether the "member of the Oneida Presbytery," who approved of the measure of *whipping religion into children*, or *children into religion*, was Dr. Lansing, or Mr. Aikin, or some other one who was "regarded as possessing more than ordinary talents, and whose praise has long been in many of the churches," we heretics do not pretend to know; nor is it very material, the fact being proved that such approval of the measure was given. Here follows the first article alluded to: S.

ONE OR TWO FACTS.

In the county of Oneida there has prevailed, and for aught we know, still prevails to some extent, the practice of *whipping children to induce them to submit to God.* In a female prayer meeting, which was held some time since in a village in that county, the mother of a little girl twelve years old, called upon her child to promise to submit to God during the prayer that was about to be offered. The child, much to the credit of her judgment, hesitated and declined. A lady who was present, suggested to the mother that it was her duty to chastise the child—that it had been done frequently in similar cases in her neighborhood, and with success; with this difference, however, that the object of the chastisement was direct—to induce them immediately to give their hearts to God. The mother actually complied with the advice and whipped her little daughter on the spot—though it must be put down to her credit, that before the day had passed, she condemned her own conduct, and, like Peter, wept bitterly.

This circumstance—the first of the kind, so far as is known, that had occurred in that village—happened to be mentioned by a venerable clergyman in the neighborhood, to one of his brethren of the Presbytery, and to his surprise, this brother appeared at once to favor the practice, and declared that he had already done so publicly. His argument in favor of it was this: "Every parent," said he, "thinks it proper to chastise his child to make him submit to *his own* authority: submission to *God* is precisely the same exercise in its nature, and why should it not be brought about by the same means?" Is there, or is there not, a connexion between doctrines and measures?

At a protracted meeting in a village not far from Utica, a clergyman had risen to preach, and was immediately interrupted by the loud groans of an individual in the congregation. Mr. B. the *presiding* clergyman immediately went to the place whence they proceeded, and falling upon his knees by the side of the individual, urged him to give up his heart to God. One or two gentlemen (one, at least, a clergyman of the old school) approached the pew, and perceived at once, from the breath and whole appearance of the man, that he was intoxicated, and stated their impressions to Mr. B. His reply was "I believe the fellow is drunk," but he still kept on urging him to give up his heart to God. At length, however, he yielded to advice, to have him taken out of the church, but directed those by whom he was taken out, to go and urge him to give up his heart!

We doubt not that many of our readers will feel, and we confess that our *feelings* are somewhat in accordance with the sentiment, that *these things are too bad to be told.* But we ask again in what way are these evils to be corrected, if they may not be exposed? While far the greater number of our periodicals are contented to say nothing on the subject, and some of them deny the existence of these irregularities, while yet they indirectly lend their full influence to encourage them, *we* can never reconcile it with the dictates of a good conscience, or the duty we owe to the church, to remain silent.—We say to all the friends of evangelical truth and order, you have a duty to perform, and it is high time that you awake to discharge it. The blessed truths of the Gospel are gradually giving way to another gospel, and the order of Christ's church is giving way to the wildfire and frenzy of human passions, and if you sleep, that part of your inheritance which you love and value most may be trampled in the dust.

Considerable excitement was occasioned by the publication of the above article, and some attempts made by the Western Recorder to deny or evade the force of it; which finally called forth an article of greater length, confirming the account, from the venerable Dr. H. Davis, late President of Hamilton College, published in the "Journal and Telegraph," from which we make the follow extract. Speaking of the mother who had whipt her daughter to make her "submit to God," or "give up her heart to God," as the phrase was, he thus proceeds:—

She said that the lady from abroad, after her daughter had for some time been urged in vain, took a corset board from her bosom and said to her, "Now to your duty." "I then took it," said the mother, "and gave C. a smart whipping: and she cried out *I will, I will.*" One of her friends, to whom this account was given, remarked to her, "You ought to be whipped yourself." The mother was much affected, shed tears, and acknowledged she had done wrong. A young lady in the family of these friends asked the daughter whether she thought she had experienced a change of heart? She replied, "*Oh, no.*" On the morning succeeding the evening when the child received the whipping, it was reported in the village of Clinton that she had submitted; and her name was enrolled, no doubt, as the practice was, among the numerous converts of the protracted meeting. The mother was asked whether her daughter had submitted?—Her answer was, "I do not know: she *promised* to do it." On the same morning there was a female prayer meeting. Mothers came with their children; who were urged by their mothers and the lady from abroad to promise to give their hearts to God, while prayers should be offered up for them. Some of them, anticipating probably the unpleasant consequences of declining, promised to do it. But there were others who could not be induced to promise. The lady from abroad exhorted their mothers to do their duty, viz. to apply the new measure. The mothers, however, much to the credit of their piety and discretion—all of them, I believe, remained unmoved. What reply they made to the entreaties of the lady I know not. One of them remarked subsequently, that she must have more light on the subject before she could do it. A pious lady in Clinton, whose testimony is worthy of all confidence, remonstrated, as she assured me, with this lady, against the new measure recommended by her. She thought children might be ruined by it; that they were in danger of being induced to think themselves Christians when they were not; of growing up hypocrites and dying such. She answered, that there was no danger at

all to be feared from it, provided parents were faithful and would do their duty—that she had used this means with all (or some) of her children, and *brought them in*; and that one of them she whipped three times, before she succeeded in doing it.

A word or two, as to this measure being approved by a member of the Oneida Presbytery. I have recently understood that the report of the fact is contradicted—not, I trust, by the gentleman himself, but by some other friend or friends of the new measures. Not many weeks after the protracted meeting in Clinton, one of my brethren of the Oneida Presbytery—a man who has been regarded as possessing more than ordinary talents, with unquestionable piety and discretion, and whose praise has long been in many of our churches—was asked by a lady in my presence, and in the presence of one or two others, "What do you think, Sir, of the practice of whipping children to induce them to promise to give their hearts to God?" He replied, "I think there is much to be said in favor of it." "I have understood," said the lady, "that you approved the practice." "The report," he added, "probably originated from the fact that I said something of the kind in an address recently made to the Maternal Association in Utica; and you will likely hear more on the subject before long. We whip our children," said he, "to induce them to submit to our authority. They are rendered kind, affectionate and obedient by it. Submission to God is the same in kind. Both are of a moral nature—why not use the same means, then, in both cases, to produce the same effect. Solomon says, 'Foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him.'" Such were his remarks, (during our conversation,) *verbatim et literatim*. They made an impression upon my mind not easily to be erased. The lady from abroad, in the conversation with the lady from Clinton, just mentioned, said to her, as she assures me, "Mr. ——— (the clergyman here alluded to) thinks just as I do on this subject." She undoubtedly heard his address in Utica. * * * *

By one who has carefully observed the stirrings of the human passions, and knows the depravity and deceitfulness of the heart; and who has been on the spot and seen the means which have been here used to produce excitement, and has had opportunity to form a judgment for himself, nothing of the kind will be regarded as incredible.

BLUE LAWS OF 1833.

In our last I published an article on the imprisonment of Miss Crandall, containing some errors which I hasten to correct. True; I spoke with caution of the source whence the information came, but still it is my duty to point out wherein that information was incorrect.—Messrs. Adams and Judson have published an address to the public, in which they say Miss Crandall, need not have been imprisoned—she might have given bail for her appearance at court but *would not*. Neither would I, had I viewed the law as it was viewed by her, and is yet viewed by myself. I will not acknowledge the jurisdiction of tyranny so far as to enter bail under its reign. They say she was imprisoned but twenty-four hours. Here, then, I plead error in *time*. She was *not* imprisoned in Watkins' cell, but in the debtors' apartment. Here I plead an error in *place*. But in both these cases the *principle* is the same. The case is yet as bad as Mrs. Foster's.

No other contradictions of my statement are made by them, and my statement was collated from the statements to which they reply. Of course, the uncontradicted portions of those statements may be set down as true.

As to the *feelings* to which they appeal in defence of the law and their proceedings under it; they are the same in kind with those which were appealed to in support of the Sunday laws, and other blue laws of former days. They declare Miss Crandall's *principles* bad, and proceed to *punish* her for teaching them. Universalism may be prosecuted by law on precisely the same grounds. The press may be muzzled, its Editors imprisoned, preachers and teachers fined, in cases without number, on the same ground. Where is freedom of opinion and freedom of speech, freedom of person and freedom of the press, if the selectmen of a town, or if *any* body of men, are thus created into an inquisitorial body, with powers to decide on the *tendency of opinions*, and to *fine* and *imprison* those who promulgate or defend *opinions* contrary to its *dictum*?

Acts are under the proper cognizance of law, but *opinions* never. Nor should there be any molestation until some injury HAS BEEN done. But in this case, Miss Crandall was arrested, imprisoned and bound over, for fear some injury *might ensue* from the establishment of her school and the inculcation of her opinions!

As to the *principles* of the abolitionists, I cannot consider them as erroneous as those of Partialism, nor as dangerous to the peace of community, were both acted out—but there *is* and *can be* no danger from either, so long as they are left free for truth to grapple with them. It is only by persecuting those who hold either—by fining and imprisoning them—that abolitionism or Partialism can be made really dangerous. This blue law—this persecution of opinion—this violation of *the liberty of speech*, will do more to build up the abolitionists than any thing they can do for themselves. I deem it the duty, therefore, of every liberal man—every friend to civil and religious liberty, to reprobate the law—put it down forever, and all other blue laws with it. Tyranny and oppression can never benefit the cause of truth and justice—can never put down fanaticism and priestcraft. And even if they could, the friends of freedom and truth should disdain to use them. In all things, therefore, contained in my first article, with the *exceptions* here named, I remain of the same mind and feeling I was in when I wrote it. G.

The Universalists in Albany are now engaged in building a spacious and elegant brick meeting-house in a central part of the city—their house of worship which they now occupy, and to which they not long since built an addition, being quite too small to accommodate the rapidly increasing congregation. The corner stone of the new church was laid on the 25th July last, and an interesting and appropriate address delivered on the occasion by Br. I. D. Williamson. We learn the building progresses with rapidity. We wish abundant success and the richest of Heaven's blessings on the laudable undertaking. S.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Extract from a letter to the Editors from a young brother in the ministry in Onondaga county.

"The cause we are engaged in is fast gaining ground in this county. It is still unpopular; but whoever lives to see a dozen years pass away, will, I think, see the doctrine proclaimed by Universalists, conquering and subduing the hearts of all people. True, the Orthodox *may* gain the ascendency for a time, and if they do, then the human race must go the retrograde path that leads to ignorance, misery and mental slavery—a slavery more to be dreaded, than that of the tyrant's yoke or the monarch's chain.

"May God avert the designs of a deceiving and tyrannical *priesthood*, by the exertions of those who are really engaged in promoting *the welfare of the whole human family*. Let us do all we can, and rest assured that he who rules "the stormy skies and manages the seas" will never suffer the labors of him who endeavors to reform the vices of the age in which he lives, to go unrewarded. There is a degree of enjoyment attached to every virtuous act, so that virtue cannot go unrewarded. W. Q."

From a letter just received from Michigan, dated, Tecumseh, July 25th, 1833, we make the following extract. In relation to the question whether we cannot look up a preacher for that place and region, we can only say we will do our best; we will present the request to the public, and if any volunteers appear we shall be happy in bidding them God speed, either as missionaries or pastors in Michigan. S.

"On the 24th and 25th of June we received a visit from Brs. Townsend and Tomlinson.—They delivered four excellent discourses, and I verily believe the seed was sown on good ground; for the liberal part of community appear to be waking, as it were, from a deep sleep, and I think it is time; for we are surrounded with Presbyterians, Methodists and Episcopalians; and their *chief* aim appears to be to *break down* Universalism. Now, Br. Skinner, can't you look us out some young Gideon who will volunteer to step forth and wield the sceptre of the Gospel of truth, and fight our battles? If you can, we will reward him handsomely for it. The Universalists in this place met about a fortnight since, to see about forming a society and raising money to support preaching; and we have come to the conclusion to form one as soon as we can circulate a subscription paper. I think there will be no difficulty in raising a sufficient sum to induce some able preacher to take up his abode in this place a part of the time. You will probably hear from this place before long concerning what I have written.

"In haste, yours affectionately, S. S*****r.

RELIGIOUS NOTICES.

Br. S. W. Fuller will preach at Leyden on the first, at Collinsville the second, and at Boonville on the third, Sunday in September.

Br. Queal will preach at Port Byron on the fourth Sunday inst.

Br. J. Chase will preach in Spafford, at the meeting-house near Rowndaу's inn, on the evening of Monday, first day of September, at half past six.

Br. Reese will preach at the Universalist meeting-house in Parma, on Friday, 6th September, at 2, P. M.

The Cayuga Association of Universalists will meet at Genoa on the last Wednesday and following Thursday in September, 1833. I would remind all the societies within its boundaries that it is *absolutely necessary* that each and every society should be duly and properly represented in the Council of this body. We do really hope that this humble request will be speedily attended to. J. Chase, jr., *Standing Clerk.*

Br. O. Roberts will preach in Litchfield, near Esq. Eacker's, on the second Sunday in September.

Br. S. R. Smith will preach at Bridgewater Corners on the first Sunday in September.

Br. J. Chase will preach at South Onondaga on the first Sunday in September, instead of the fourth Sunday in the present month.

New Association.—Agreeably to a resolution of the Central Association, a meeting to organize a new Association will be held at Fly Creek, Otsego county, on the *first Wednesday and following Thursday* in September next. Religious services may be expected on each day.

*** Societies in the counties of Schoharie, Otsego and Herkimer, formerly included in the bounds of the Central Association, are notified to choose delegates to attend the same. Statistical information from every society is earnestly requested.

Br. Bullard will preach at Laurens, on Monday evening, September 9th—at Oneonta, Tuesday, 10th, at 1 o'clock, P. M.; and at Franklin, Giles' inn, in the evening—at Meredith, Wednesday, 11th, at 1 o'clock, P. M., and at Kortwright in the evening—at Harpersfield, on Thursday, 12th, at 1 o'clock, P. M., and also in the evening—at Waterville, on Friday evening—at Delhi, on Saturday evening—at Hamden, on Sunday, 15th, A. M. and P. M., (text John iii: 3,) and at Walton in the evening—at Colchester, on Monday evening, 16th—at the schoolhouse, near King Mead's, Tuesday evening, 17th—at Franklin village, on Wednesday, at 1 o'clock, P. M., and at Huntsville in the evening.

Brs. Skinner and Freeman will exchange pulpits on the first Sunday in September—the former to preach at Madison and lecture at Lebanon in the evening, and the latter in this city.

LETTERS CONTAINING REMITTANCES,

Received at this Office for the week ending on Wednesday last

P. M., Mill Creek, (M. T.) for D. D. and J. S.—P. M., West Henrietta, for E. S. and L. W. ☞ L. W.'s account correct.—A. A., Pike, for self, D. G., M. S., B. S., P. G., L. G., A. S. and O. O.; and for Christian Visitant.—P. M., Erie, (Pa.,) for J. G. and B. D.—P. M., Fall Creek, for T. R.—P. M., Champion South Road, for S. L. D.—S. J., Clarkstown, (Pa.)

POETRY.

[*For the Magazine and Advocate.*]

"FEAR NOT."—By J. Chase.

In earth, or heaven, or hell, what should we fear,
Since God, our everlasting Friend, is near?
He made us, loves us, saves us from all harm,
And leads to bliss by his almighty arm.

Let those who know not God, distrust his love;
And cease to rev'rence Him who rules above;
And tremble at the shrine of dreaded Wrath
About to burst its thunders in their path!

Fear not! 'tis *love* that binds the soul to God,
And justifies in him the chast'ning rod
Which never yet was used with bad intent—
To give vindictive wrath revengeful vent.

Fear not! ye sons of men, for God's decree
In his chastisements, is, to make us free
From sin; cause us his mercies sweet to know,
And teach us how to serve him here below.

To Him all partial *evil* is a *mean* of good,
And not an *end*, as some have understood;
Else, how his counsel can securely stand,
Is more than I can see, or comprehend.

Jehovah's *pleasure* must be all complete—
Both ends of his design must surely meet—
Fear not! I say, nor let your banner fall,
For this is *truth*—"God shall be *all* in *all*."

ROCKS OF LAKE SUPERIOR.

BY GOVERNOR CASS.

Upon the southern coast of Lake Superior, about fifty miles from the falls of St. Mary, are the immense precipitous cliffs, called by the voyagers, Le Potrail and the Pictured Rocks. This name has been given them in consequence of the different appearances which they present to the traveller, as he passes their base in his canoe. It requires little aid from the imagination to discern in them the castellated tower and lofty dome, spires and pinnacles, and every sublime, grotesque, or fantastic shape which the genius of architecture ever invented. These cliffs are an unbroken mass of rocks, rising to an elevation of 300 feet above the level of the lake, and stretching along the coast for fifteen miles. The voyagers never pass this coast except in the most perfect calm; and the Indians, before they make the attempt, offer their accustomed oblation, to propitiate the favor of their Manitas. The eye instinctively searches along this eternal rampart for a single place of security; but the search is vain. With an impassable barrier of rocks on one side, and an interminable expanse of water on the other, a sudden storm upon the lake would as inevitably insure destruction of the passenger in his frail canoe, as if he were on the brink of the cataract of Niagara. The rock itself is a sandstone, which is disintegrated by the continual action of the water with comparative facility. There are no broken masses upon which the eye can rest and find relief. The lake is so deep, that these masses, as they are torn from the precipice, are concealed beneath its waves until they are reduced to sand. The action of the waves has undermined every projecting point: and there the immense precipice rests upon arches, and the foundation is intersected with caverns in every direction.

When we passed this immense fabric of nature, the wind was still, and the lake was calm. But even the slightest motion of the waves, which, in the most profound calm, agitates these internal seas, swept through the deep caverns with the noise of distant thunder, and died away upon the ear as it rolled forward in the dark recesses, inaccessible to human observation. No sound more melancholy or more awful ever vibrated upon human nerves. It has left an impression which neither time nor distance can ever efface. Resting in a frail bark' canoe upon the limpid waters of the lake, we seemed almost suspended in air, so pellucid is the element upon which we floated. In gazing upon the towering battlements which impended over us, and from which the smallest fragment would have destroyed us, we felt, intensely, our own insignificance. No situation can be imagined more appalling to the courage, or more humbling to the pride of man. We appeared like a speck upon the face of creation. Our whole party, Indians and voyagers, and soldiers, officers, and servants, contemplated in mute astonishment that awful display of creative power, at whose base we hung; and no sound broke upon the ear to interrupt the ceaseless roaring of the waters. No splendid cathedral, no temple built with human hands, no pomp of worship could ever impress the spectator with such humility, and so strong a conviction of the immense distance between him and the Almighty Architect.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

The Herald of Freedom and Gospel Witness, after mentioning Humiston's murder of his wife in Hamden, Ct., under the influence of ardent spirits, contains the following pertinent remarks: S.

These are most truly the days of murder and suicide. Hardly a paper comes to hand but brings some horrid accounts of the most brutal murders and shocking suicides. The father inhumanly dashes out the brains of his innocent prattlers; the husband deliberately raises the axe and cleaves open the head of his bosom companion; the brother draws the blood-stained steel from the bosom of his innocent and expiring sister, and even the *minister of the Gospel*, the professed follower of Christ, *seduces* and *murders* his poor defenceless victim! The dreadful and numerous accounts of tragedies of the blackest dye which are daily pouring in quick succession upon us, are calculated not only to fill the mind with astonishment, but also to lead us to inquire "when shall the end of these things be?" Let us banish the *causes* which produce these dreadful *effects*, and the whole work is accomplished. It is a fact which we presume but few will deny, that *intemperance* and *religious fanaticism* are the causes of more cases of suicide and murder than every other evil in the United States.—These curses to society should be discountenanced by every friend to morality and peace; and temperance, charitableness, and "good will to men" should be substituted in their stead. Let these things be done, and this moral pestilence will in a great degree subside; but until this "consummation devoutly to be wished" takes place, our Union will continue to be filled with blood, carnage, and death.

From the Herald and Watchman.

"Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he, also, himself, likewise, took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them, who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. He that committeth sin, is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose was the Son of God manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil."—*Bible.*

Ye who contend for the endless existence of the devil and his works, and for the perpetuation of sin and misery to all eternity; how will you get along with the plain and positive declarations, that the devil and his works shall be destroyed? Will Christ be defeated in his purpose? Will he fail of accomplishing the object of his mission? If not—if the pleasure of the Lord prospers in his hand; then why maintain that the works of the devil will remain, and satan live on, and establish his kingdom of darkness to all eternity, in opposition to the host of heaven, and the kingdom of light and purity? How long, ye Partialists, will ye continue to forsake the word of God, to abide by the creeds and commandments of men? How long, ye preachers of endless wrath! before ye will learn to speak forth the words of truth and soberness; and declare that Christ shall reign, until he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, and have subdued all things unto himself, and God be all in all?

May that be perfected, which is now lacking concerning your faith.

Lisle N. Y. N. D.

The Methodists and Avery.—The Washington Globe of the 17th inst. says that an agent of the New-England Methodist Conference is travelling throughout the States, soliciting contributions to pay the expenses of Avery's defence. It further adds, that on the Sunday previous $150 was taken up for that purpose, in two churches in that city. If the agent continues to be favored with such good luck, he will return to Boston after having fleeced the pockets of the credulous portion of community out of some *Fifty thousand Dollars!* This is the first time we ever heard of turning a most outrageous and diabolical murder to a *profitable* account! What cannot *priestcraft* accomplish when fairly put to the test? The commands of God and man can be broken with impunity by *priests*, and then the public are called upon to *reward* them in *cash* for their wickedness! *O, Tempora! O, Mores!*

From the Newport Republican.

REV. EPHRAIM K. AVERY.

It is customary with clergymen at times to give out to their hearers that they may select such a text from the Bible as they wish to have expounded.—We learn from Fall River that agreeably to this custom the Rev. Ira M. Bidwell, who is thought by many to be more closely intimate than some others in the Avery transaction, announced that he would preach from such a text as should be selected; accordingly, the following from Hosea, v: 3. was handed to Mr. Bidwell for a text:—"I know *Ephraim*, and Israel is not hid from me; for now, O Ephraim, thou committest whoredom and Israel is defiled."

This was too much. The chapter is headed, "God's judgment against priests," and the Rev. Mr. Bidwell, it appears, was not aware that Hosea had prophesied, in part, of the crimes and plot of Ephraim K. Avery and Co.

It is perhaps needless to add that the Rev. I. M. Bidwell altogether declined an exposition of the text.

Protens.

A lady applying to Reynolds, the philanthrophist, on behalf of an orphan—after he had given liberally, she said, "When he is old enough, I will teach him to name and thank his benefactor." "Stop, (said the good man) thou art mistaken: we do not thank the clouds for the rain—teach him to look higher and thank Him who giveth both the clouds and the rain."

Walking.—An idle, disorderly fellow having proposed to set about walking for a wager. "You had better," said his landlord, "*walk about your business.*"

DEATHS.

At Baldwinsville, on the 30th of June, Mrs. Lucy Hall, wife of Mr. Hiram Hall, aged 29 years. The deceased sustained a fair and exemplary character, as many, who live to bless her memory and deplore their loss, can abundantly testify. She has left a husband to mourn the loss of a kind wife, and two small daughters an affectionate mother. May the Father of mercies grant them the consolations of his spirit, enable them to bear the stroke with Christian fortitude, and say from the heart, "Thy will be done." Her funeral was attended by a numerous concourse of neighbors and friends, and the consolations of the Gospel were tendered to them by the writer of this notice. W. Quale.

At South Onondaga, on the 21st of June, an only son of Mr. and Mrs. Carter, aged 7 years. They have frequently been called, in the dispensations of divine Providence, to experience those afflictions which are sorely trying to the parental heart; and were it not for the consolations of the Gospel, their affliction would be insupportable. But while they are called to mourn the loss of their son here, they can look forward to that happy time when they shall meet him in unclouded skies, beyond the confines of the tomb. W. Q.

CLINTON LIBERAL INSTITUTE.

The Summer term of the Clinton Liberal Institute, commenced on the fourth Monday in May last, and will continue, without vacation, to the 25th September. It has now about sixty students. The building is new, spacious and convenient, the situation pleasant and healthy, and the terms and course of instruction such as warrant the most successful progress of the pupils. More than one hundred students can be well accommodated.

Lowest price of tuition, for fourteen weeks, $4.00
Highest " " 6.00
Board and washing, on an average, $1.50 per week.
No student received for less than half a term.
Mr. R. C. Thummel, Principal and Professor of Languages.
" G. R. Perkins, Professor of Mathematics.
" W. E. Manly, assistant teacher.

The Ladies' School attached to the Institute is kept in a building erected for that purpose, and will accommodate about seventy scholars. It has about thirty pupils, all of whom will board in private families.

Lowest price of tuition, per quarter, $3.00
Highest " " 5.00
Music, drawing and French language, separate charges
Board and washing, on an average, $1.50 per week.
Miss Almira Meech, Instructress.
Clinton, June, 1833.

THE MAGAZINE AND ADVOCATE,

IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

BY DOLPHUS SKINNER, *Proprietor.*

TERMS.—To Mail and office Subscribers, $1.50 per annum, in *advance*, or within *three months*; $2 if not paid within *six months*, or $2 50 if not paid *within the year*. No subscription received for less than one year, (unless the money be paid in advance,) and no paper discontinued till all arrearages are paid, except at the discretion of the Publisher. Agents, or Companies, paying for *eight copies*, are entitled to the *ninth, gratis*. All communications, by mail, to the Editors, must be post-paid, or free. ☞ To City Subscribers, who receive their papers by a Carrier, $2 per annum payable in advance.

A. B. GROSH, PRINTER.

Canal Buildings, corner of Seneca and Liberty-streets. ☞ Entrance by the stairs on Seneca-street. ☜